

r									
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
3	GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED,)								
4	Plaintiff,)								
5	vs.) No. 99cv2668 H (AJB)								
6	VYSIS, INC.,								
7	Defendant.)								
8									
9	The confidential deposition of DONALD								
10	NEIL HALBERT, Ph.D., called as a witness for								
11	examination, taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of								
12	Civil Procedure of the United States District								
13	Courts pertaining to the taking of depositions,								
14	taken before ANDREA L. CARTER, a Notary Public								
15	within and for the County of Cook, State of								
16	Illinois, and a Certified Shorthand Reporter of								
17	said state, CSR No. 84-3722, at 100 Abbott Park								
18	Road, Abbott, Illinois, on the 19th day of April,								
19	A.D. 2001, at 10:17 a.m.								
20									
21									
22									
23									
24	COPY								





1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

		Q.	Αt	: 16	east a	as to	the	four		the	Exampl	.es
4	thr	ough	7,.	is	there	any	info	ormati	lon	or	referen	ıce
wi	Lth	respe	ect	to	those	e exa	mple	s that	с ус	ou w	ould	
cl	nara	cteri	ize	to	sugge	est s	peci	fic an	mpli	ific	ation?	
		_	m -				_: fi	- amn	1 i f i	icat	ion?	

- To suggest specific amplific Α.
- Yes. Q.
- Not to my knowledge. Α.
- Of any of the examples, not just limited Q. to Examples 4 through 7, but for any of the examples 1 through 7, is there any -- any information associated with those four examples in the '338 patent that you recognize to be the result of any experimental work that you conducted while at either Gene-Trak or Amoco?
- That I recognize as being the result of my own experimental work?
 - Q. Yes, sir.
- I don't have clear enough recollection Α. of that.
- And my question was that limited, but Q. let me expand it a little bit.

Do you recognize anything about Examples 1 through 7 that you recognize to be the result of experimental work that you supervised while you

